

### REMARKS

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1 through 12, and consideration and allowance of new Claims 13 through 16 in view of the above amendments and the following arguments.

### THE CLAIMS ARE NOT ANTICIPATED OR OBVIOUS IN VIEW OF WALKER

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, and 4-12 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,024,640 to Walker et al. (the "Walker Patent" or "Walker"), and rejected Claim 3 as being obvious in view of the Walker Patent. The Applicants believe that the claims as amended are not anticipated or rendered obvious by the Walker Patent.

The Walker Patent discloses a system in which a player purchases a number of predetermined game outcomes at a retail location and receives a hard copy receipt or data carrier containing the purchased outcomes. The player may then input data from the receipt or smart card at a remote player terminal to reveal the outcomes.

The Examiner likened the Lottery Authority and the LCC in Walker as the manufacturing device required in element (b) of Applicants' Claim 1. However, Claim 1 as amended above requires that the manufacturing device produce the non-volatile data record or a hard copy ticket record for each respective electronic lottery ticket in the game set **prior to a ticket request** corresponding to the respective electronic lottery ticket. In contrast, aside from generating a randomized prize datastream, the Walker Patent only suggests storing a record of the outcomes purchased by a player at the LCC and producing an outcome transfer message identifying the assigned outcomes. Walker certainly does not teach or suggest producing a non-volatile data record or a hard copy ticket for each respective electronic lottery ticket in the game set (separate

from the prize datastream itself) **prior to the ticket request corresponding to the respective electronic ticket.** The LCC in the Walker Patent only stores a separate record of the outcomes after they are assigned in response to a request for outcomes, that is, by definition **after the request for outcomes.**

Claim 6 is amended similarly to Claim 1 to require that the hard copy/nonvolatile data records are produced prior to any ticket request. New Claim 13 includes a similar limitation. Thus the arguments presented above with respect to Claim 1 apply equally to Claims 6 and 13.

For these reasons, the Applicants submit that Claims 1, 6, and 13 are not anticipated or rendered obvious over the Walker Patent and are entitled to allowance together with their respective dependent claims.

CONCLUSION

For all of the above reasons, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1 through 12 and consideration and allowance of Claims 13 through 16.

If the Examiner should feel that any issue remains as to the allowability of these claims, or that a conference might expedite allowance of the claims, he is asked to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

SHAFFER & CULBERTSON, L.L.P.

Date: October 30, 2003

By: 

Russell D. Culbertson, Reg. No. 32,124  
J. Nevin Shaffer, Jr., Reg. No. 29,858  
Trevor Lind, 54,785  
1114 Lost Creek Blvd. - Suite 420  
Austin, Texas 78746  
512-327-8932 voice  
512-327-2665 fax  
Attorneys for Applicants

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, (Fax No. 703-872-9303) on October 30, 2003.

Reg. No. 32,124, Russell D. Culbertson 